FILED - USDC -NH 2022 JUL 11 PM12:26

5741

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Josephine Amatucci

٧.

Young case1227 SM

Mullen, Joe Laplante case...21-cv-237- LM

Trooper Hawley Rae....220cv-202-SM

HELLO000000000000

AND THE CASES THAT THE MAGISTRATE LEFT OUT THAT ARE ACTIVE:

Town of Wolfeboro, Wright, Bedley, etc. 21-cv-1081-LM

Mr. Greenhalghn.....

RESPONSE TO MAGISTRATE'S CASE STATUS ORDER

DATED 7/1/2022

- 1. This summary of the status of each open case as described by the Magistrate is...... NOT A TRUE STATUSof each open case. And case 1081 which includes the infamous Mr. Greenhalgn was never mentioned as an open case.
- 2. A STATUS HEARING IN PERSON must be allowed by the Judge.
- 3. The Status hearing will plrove that there is no case, that any litigation is over, that the evidence filed by the Plaintiff is sufficient evidence to bring before a jury of her peers for damages ONLY. That the evidence of an excessive force claim,

with NO PROBABLE CAUSE, is enough evidence for a 4th Amendment violation, an unlawful seizure, where there is NO IMMUNITY under the Law of the land, under 1983.

- 4. That there is enough evidence before the Court of a Monell claim where a policymaking official, Ms. Melissa Banks, a policymkaing official was the DIRECT CAUSE for the Plaintiff's injury by Young, when Ms. Banks ordered Young to remove the Plaintiff from a public place where she was rightly redressing her grivevnce to government. Besides, all the other evidence filed in the case, where under New Hampshire LAW, the Sheriff's Dept. is indeed liable for the unlawful acts of the sheriffs, employees.
- 5. The Plaintiff lawsuit under 21-cv-237 did not add as a defendant a JUDGE, as FRAUDULENTLY stating by the Magistrate. The defendant was Joe Laplante as an INDIVIDUAL and not as a Judge. Joe Laplante lost jurisdiction as a judge when he trespassed against the Constitution, when he violated his OATH OF OFFICE when he FRAUDULENTLY allowed Mullen summary judgment, under FRAUD, stating that the Plaintiff was never arrested or prosecuted for speeding, when he had all the evidence before him in the case files, that the Plaintiff was indeed arrested and prosecuted for speeding. Where speeding is not a crime in New Hampshire. Therefore, is rulings are void of no legal force, and when there is a violation of the Federal Constitution defendant Laplante as an individual has NO IMMUNITY, and where Laplante and Mullen were not defendants in the previous case, there is NO RES JUDICATA, NO COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND NO STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS, under 1983.
- 6. Under the case regarding defendants The Town of Wolfeboro, Rondeau, Estes, Wright, Greenhalghn, there is no conflict that the Plaintiff was unlawfully and maliciously prosecuted, that her liberty rights were DETAINED, SEIZED, when she was

obligated to attend court hearings, a violation of the Fourth Amendment, and that Mr. Greenhalghn was not acting as a judge, when as an official he was detaining the Plaintiff without legal grounds, an Act that was not in furtherance of his official function, or in the pursuit of the authority vested in him, he was acting in a private capacity or as a private individual, where he knew there was no injury, no victim, no case, and where under Due Process of the LAW it was his duty to dismiss the Complaint instead of litigating a case where he had no jurisdiction to rule on, and in doing so Greenhalghn lost all authority to litigate the case making his rulings VOID OF NO LEGAL FORCE, as they were based on FRAUD ON/UPON THE COURT. As there was sufficient evidence in the files, especially the Affidavit stated by the supposed victim that there was NO ASSAULT WITH BODILY INJURY, an Act that the Plaintiff was FRAUDULENTLY being accused of. And remember this man had me put in jail during the course of the trial, an offense of KIDNAPPING, where in acting as an individual and in violating Due Process, Greenhalgn had no jurisdiction to do so.

- 7. Therefore, the evidence before the court shows:
- (a) The defendants cannot and never disputed that the Plaintiff was assaulted by Young INSIDE THE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,;
- (b) That there is no dispute that she was NOT ASSAULTED in the Adminsitration Building;
- (c) That there is NO DISPUTE that UNDER THE LAW, and UNDER MONELL, the Sheriff's Dept. is liable for damages' and under Due Process;
- (d) That there is NO DISPUTE that there is NO IMMUNITY for the defendants under the Constitutional Law, the law of the land, when a person's Constitutional rights are violated under 1983;
- (e) There is NO DISPUTE that Mullen and Laplante were not defendants in the previous case, therefore there is no Res Judicata, no Collateral Estoppel, NO DISPUTE that Laplante is not being sued as an judge, but as an INDIVIDUAL.

WHEREFORE: It is the Plaintiff's evidence and not the hearsay of the defendants that supports

the merits of the Plaintiff's her claims. And therefore this Court is MANDATED to IMMEDIATELY rule on the merits of the case, and to determine that this case is going to a jury of her peers forDAMAGES ONLY. As it is the evidence that speaks the truth and not the FRAUD AND HEARSAY of the individuals involved in this case, not their opinions, not the Legislature, but ONLY THE LAW OF THE LAND THAT SPEAKS AND RULES on the violations of the Federal Constitution, where there is NO IMMUNITY.

That the Plaintiff is demanding an in person status of the claims that she cites in this motion, to determine her right to a jury trial of her peers for DAMAGES ONLY. As there are NO DISPUTES as to her claims, that on the merit. End any litigation NOW or the Court will be abusing an elderly person under FRAUD ON/UPON the Court.

Repectfully,

Josephine Amatucci

July 8, 2022 Josephine Jm atricci P. J. Box 242 WolfeBoRo FAILS N.W. 03896

FROM: JOSEPHINE THATIVEE DOCUMENT 5 Filed 07/11/22 Page 5 of 5 MANCHESTER NH 030 8 JUL 2022 PM 3 L



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE OFFice OF The CLERK 5-5 PLEASANT ST. ROOM 110 CONCORD N. H. 03301

03301-394135